



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,017	08/01/2006	Teiko Sutoh	30162/41537	4672
4743	7590	06/25/2009	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP			MCKANE, ELIZABETH L	
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE				
6300 SEARS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/551,017	SUTOH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	ELIZABETH L. MCKANE	1797

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Elizabeth L McKane/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue on page 4 of the Response that the "combination of an organic metal complex and an alcohol - as recited in each of the pending, rejected claims-is neither taught nor suggested in Patel." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In fact, Patel specifically teaches use of an organic metal complex (page 12, lines 10-26) and further discloses use of an alcohol as an additive for aqueous ink compositions (page 16, lines 1-2). Applicants further state that Chujo fails to teach a plasma sterilization indicator. The Examiner recognizes this but notes that Chujo is not an anticipatory reference and thus, is not required to do so. What Chujo does disclose, however, is motivation to add a polyvalent alcohol to the aqueous ink composition of Patel. Thus, the rejection is both proper and maintained.

Applicants further submit that neither Patel nor Chujo recognize the use of an alcohol to increase the discoloration speed of the indicator. However, it has been held that where the substance is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103, it is immaterial that applicant may have disclosed an obvious or unobvious further purpose or advantage for the substance. See *In re Graf*, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965); *In re Finsterwalder*, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971). Chujo discloses the use of the alcohol in a known manner - as a solvent to control viscosity in an aqueous ink composition, thus having a known and expected result. In this case, since Chujo provides motivation to employ a polyvalent alcohol as the alcohol in the aqueous ink composition of Patel, the invention is rendered obvious.

Although Applicants allege unexpected results, as shown in Examples 1 and 2 and Comparative Examples 1 and 2, the Examiner does not find the results unexpected as the examples show only the results of adding the polyvalent alcohol to the ink composition. Patel already teaches adding an alcohol as well. Results comparing polyvalent alcohols to other known solvent alcohols would be required to show unexpected results.